DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 754 CS 503 715

AUTHOR Austin, Bruce A.
TITLE The Salience of Selected Variables on Choice for Movie Attendance among High School Students.
PUB DATE Feb 82
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Denver, CO, February 20-24, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Research; Factor Analysis; *Films; High School Students; *Leisure Time; Media Research; *Predictor Variables; Secondary Education; *Student Attitudes; *Student Interests

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire was designed for a study assessing both the importance of 28 variables in movie attendance and the importance of movie-going as a leisure-time activity. Respondents were 130 ninth and twelfth grade students. The 28 variables were broadly organized into eight categories: movie production personnel, production elements, advertising, criticism and reviewing, interpersonal influence, perception of film content, financial costs to the patron, and miscellaneous. Overall, 4.2% of the sample reported movie-going as a favorite leisure activity. This percentage was slightly higher than those of similar studies, and suggested that movie-going as a leisure activity diminished with age. When data on the 28 variables were analyzed, subject matter of the film and interpersonal contact were the reasons cited most often for going to films. The data also demonstrated the low salience of "behind-the-screen" production personnel in attracting high school movie-goers. The frequent movie-goers in the sample considered more of the 28 variables as being important in making their choices than did the occasional movie-goers. Overall, the 28 variables accounted for nearly one-third of the movie attendance variance in a multiple regression analysis. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210754

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE SALIENCE OF SELECTED VARIABLES ON CHOICE FOR MOVIE ATTENDANCE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

BRUCE A. AUSTIN

Rochester Institute of Technology
College of General Studies
Rochester, New York 14623

A Paper Presented

To

The Western Speech Communication
Association Annual Convention
Mass Communication Interest Group
23 February 1982
Denver, Colorado

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce A. Austin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 503 715

THE SALIENCE OF SELECTED VARIABLES ON CHOICE FOR MOVIE ATTENDANCE AMONG HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

As an object for study, the motion picture medium has historically drawn considerable research attention from historians, aestheticians, and students of law and technology. Such research studies as offered by scholars from these various disciplinary perspectives are justified as being both needed and important to the individual wishing to gain a complete understanding of cinema. Somewhat surprising, however, is the paucity of valid and reliable research of the recipients -- the consumers -- of motion pictures.[1]

Systematic study of the film audience properly, but not necessarily exclusively, falls within the purview of social scientists trained in such academic disciplines as communications, psychology, and sociology, among others. While social scientists, enamored with the other major media of mass communications, have consistently and prolifically gone about the business of conducting studies resulting in the compiling of encyclopedic volumes devoted to the audience for the medium of their interest, the research field on film audiences is largely unexplored. The mass communications student in search of audience analysis for any of the contemporary mass media but one -- motion pictures -- is faced (perhaps intimidated would be a better term in some instances) with formidable and seemingly never-ending card catalogue drawers, journal articles, convention papers, books, and governmental

literature. Film audience researchers, on the other hand, typically find themselves inundated with a veritable forest of verbiage, little of which is theoretically and methodologically systematic, coherent, or valid. The dearth of published empirical data on the film audience is clearly illustrated by a recent comprehensive bibliography of such research which reported only 104 entries since 1960.[2] Although the quantity of studies might seem impressive, it is hardly so when considered from the perspective of a medium with a nearly one hundred year history.[3] The state of the art in film audience research has perhaps been best summarized by Simonet:

> Motion picture audience research has been growing as a science from humble beginnings to more grandiose beginnings.[4] But it seems always to have been making beginnings.

PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

As has long been recognized -- at least since 1948, when the dramatic drop in weekly film admissions began -- contemporary movie-goers are far more selective in their film attendance behavior than were their counterparts when the medium was at its height in popularity. The findings of several studies[5] support the concept of a discriminating audience: for most individuals, movie-going appears to be a directionally specific activity; people go to a movie, not the movies. Thus, for most people, most of the time, we need not look for theories of motivation concerning going to the movies; rather, what needs to be investigated are the decision factors, or salient variables,

which motivate going to a movie. Therefore, while the uses and gratifications approach to mass communications[6] might be an appropriate strategy for examining, understanding, and explaining movie attendance as a general activity, it would seem a less appropriate approach when applied to a specific movie attendance. Moreover, this concept of a discriminating movie audience causes us to change, for the most part, the focus of our attention away from such research as the effect of social isolation[7] and differential personality types[8] as motivations for movie attendance.

An important theoretical issue, therefore, with regard to film audiences, which has largely been ignored by social scientists, is the salience individuals attribute to a variety of film-specific variables which, in turn, help to determine their particular movie-going experience. Thus, this study details the results of an investigation of the importance of 28 potentially influential variables in movie attendance decisions. Based on the concept of a discriminating audience, the research questions this study addresses are:

1. How important is movie-going as a leisure-time activity?
2. How important were these 28 variables in the individuals' most recent decision to attend a movie and what percentage of the movie attendance variance was predicted by these 28 variables?

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

To understand, explain, and predict movie-going, a theoretical perspective is not only useful but necessary. The purposes of the

present study suggest the relevancy of motivational research. A cognitive approach to motivation which emphasizes that individuals make behavioral choices based on the value of differing outcomes they perceive as available to them is the Expectancy x Value model. Here, it is proposed, persons appraise a given situation, formulate possible outcomes of a variety of actions they might take as well as the consequences of those outcomes, and then choose that behavioral alternative for which the product of these variables is maximal.[9] As Korman states, this theory of motivation most closely approximates the model of "economic man."[10]

As applied to movie attendance behavior and the selection of a particular film for attendance, Expectancy x Value theory would suggest that individuals perceive a number of variables impinging upon their movie attendance behavior. These variables, each to a lesser or greater extent, may be conceptualized as the components entering the individual's appraisal process. Concomitantly, the variables are likely to, perhaps simultaneously, affect both the outcomes (decision to attend one film over another) and the consequences (e.g., enjoyment of the film selected) of the individual's behavioral choice. The question, then, becomes: What is the differential weighting of these variables that produces the behavior? The present study seeks to provide at least a tentative answer to this question.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The 28 variables considered in this study were selected on the basis of both previous research and intuition. A priori, these 28 variables may be broadly categorized into eight areas: production personnel (director, producer, screenwriter, male and female stars), production elements (music, photography, title, Motion Picture Association of America rating [G, PG, R, X]), advertising (previews, and ads in newspapers, magazines, television and radio), criticism and reviewing (in newspapers, magazines, television, and radio), interpersonal influence (from friends and parents), perception of film content (plot and genre), financial costs to the patron (price of admission, proximity of theater, and incidental expenses), and other (nomination for and winning of an Academy Award).

A myriad of anecdotal reports have stressed the salience of many of these variables as they relate to a film's popularity and hence, presumably, the individual's motivation process.[11] Such strictly speculative, and oftentimes contradictory, remarks offer little in the way of advancing and confirming the independent and cumulative contribution of these variables to film attendance behavior. Although their heuristic value may be great, their theoretical utility remains questionable until subject to testing.

A few social science reports have investigated some of the variables considered here independent (or in isolation) of the other variables also considered by this report (i.e., studies that researched the impact of stars, critics, or word-of-mouth[12]

on film attendance or popularity as discrete objects for scrutiny). For the purposes of the present study the three reports to be reviewed here are of primary significance for two important reasons. First, all three studies sought to investigate the influence, or importance, of several variables on film choice. Second, all three studies employed a sample survey thereby avoiding the methodological pitfalls of non-survey studies.[13]

The earliest of the three studies to be discussed here was reported by Silvey and Kenyon.[14] Their sample consisted of 831 British movie-goers. Silvey and Kenyon found that, of eight variables examined, the film's subject and cast were the most important reasons for their sample's most recent cinema experience and the film's title and producer/director were the least important. Similar results were found by the Los Angeles Times study[15] which investigated 15 variables: subject matter and cast were the two most important factors in determining whether or not to see a movie and the producer/director, length of the movie, title, and results of Academy Awards were least influential. Austin[16] investigated the importance assigned to 28 variables (the same as those examined by this study) by college students for their most recent film attendance. As was found by the other two studies, subject matter was clearly the most important variable and production personnel (producer, screenwriter, and director) the least important variables. But whereas the Times and Silvey and Kenyon studies found actors to be important, Austin reported the male and female stars to be of lesser importance than television advertisements, previews, title of the film, and price of admission. In

summary, the findings of the three most germane studies, for the purposes of this report, all agree that subject matter is the most important variable influencing motivation for film choice; "behind-the-screen" production personnel were found to be least important.

An important distinction between the Times study and Austin and Silvey and Kenyon's research is that the Times report examined its variables in a context-free setting (i.e., movie-going in general) while the other two studies presented the respondents with the variables in a context-specific setting (i.e., most recent movie-going experience). It can be suggested that the context-specific approach is methodologically preferable since respondents' answers can be assumed more accurate, and hence valid, when asked to recall information as applied to a specific film situation rather than movie-going in general.

METHODOLOGY

Respondents to the self-administered questionnaire used for this study were students enrolled in 9th and 12th grade English Composition classes of a northeastern public high school.[17] A nonprobability convenience sample was used.[18] A total of 130 questionnaires were distributed, all of which were usable. Distribution and collection of the questionnaires occurred in May 1980.

Respondents ranged in age from 14 to 19 years ($\bar{X}$=16.1 years). The sample was evenly divided between males and females; 52% were 9th grade students and 48% were 12th graders. The sample was

subdivided into two groups, frequent and occasional movie-goers. Frequent movie-goers were defined as those respondents who reported attending films twice a month or more (n=37).

The questionnaire used in this study was designed to assess the importance respondents assigned to the 28 variables in their most recent film-going experience and the importance of movie-going as a leisure-time activity. In order to determine most recent film attendance, the respondents were asked to record the title of the last movie they had seen as well as "who or what drew your attention to the film." Following these two open-ended questions, the participants were directed to indicate their opinion concerning the importance of each of the 28 variables in their attendance decision on a seven-point rating scale. Response options ranged from "very important" to "very unimportant." Importance of movie-going as a leisure-time activity was measured by two methods: (1) an open-ended question asked the respondents to name their favorite leisure-time activity and (2) the respondents were asked to indicate the importance they assigned movie-going as a leisure-time activity on a seven-point rating scale.

A test-retest reliability check on the survey instrument was conducted.[19] Using Pearson product-moment correlation, the overall reliability index of test-retest across a sample of the survey items was +.70. Individual item coefficients ranged from +.56 ($p < .001$, one-tailed) to +.98 ($p < .001$, one-tailed).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The first research question asked: How important is movie-going as a leisure-time activity? Responses to the open-ended questionnaire item inquiring as to the participants' favorite leisure-time activity were coded into one of eleven categories. Overall, going to the movies was reported as a favorite leisure-time activity by 4.2% of the sample; 3.2% of the occasional and 5.4% of the frequent filmgoers reported going to the movies as their favorite leisure-time activity. Compared to other studies which have asked the same (or similar) question, movie-going as a favorite activity was, percentage-wise, found to be slightly more prevalent in the present study. Among college students Austin[20] reported that 2.5% of his sample named movie-going as their favorite leisure activity (.9% among the occasional and 6% among the frequent attenders). The Los Angeles Times study found that 2% of its total sample and 2.5% of the teenagers in its sample reported movie-going as their favorite leisure activity.

The second method used to measure the importance participants assigned to movie-going as a leisure-time activity was their response to a survey item with a seven-point response scale (1=very unimportant). For the sample as a whole the mean response was 4.1; among occasional movie-goers the mean response was 3.6 while frequent movie-goers had a mean response of 4.6. The difference in mean responses between occasional and frequent movie-goers, as might be intuitively suspected, was significant ($t=4.569$, $df=128$, $p<.001$, two-tailed). By way of comparison, the college students in Austin's study, responding to the same

question and using the same seven-point rating scale, had a mean response of 3.7 (3.4 for occasional movie-goers and 4.2 for frequent movie-goers).

Based on the findings of the present study it can be concluded that movie-going is considered as a favorite leisure activity for only a tiny percentage of this sample. Far more frequently, these respondents reported activities such as sports and socializing with friends as their favorite leisure-time activity. However, compared to the college students in Austin's 1981 report the high school students participating in the study reported here named movie-going as a favorite leisure activity more frequently in the open-ended condition and had a higher mean response on the seven-point rating scale. The data seems to suggest, then, that the importance of movie-going as a leisure activity diminishes with age. Future research might recast the "favorite leisure-time" question into a more specific context of spectator amusements. By placing movie-going in such a context, important comparative data may be gathered (e.g., movie attendance vis-à-vis spectator sports, theater, etc.).

The second research question inquired as to the importance of 28 variables in the respondents' most recent decision to attend a movie. The respondents reported a total of 55 different titles as their most recent movie attended. A preliminary method for obtaining information regarding the importance of various factors on attendance decisions was responses to the open-ended question which asked "who or what drew your attention to the film [most recently attended]." Responses to this question were coded into

eight categories. Table 1 reports the percentage distribution

---

Table 1 About Here

---

by type of response for both attendance groups. The subject matter of the film and interpersonal contact were the two most frequently recorded responses. These two categories accounted for more than 50% of the total response among both aggregates. Overall no significant difference ($p > .05$) was found between groups.

Table 2 presents the mean score, standard deviation, and rank for each of the 28 variables relative to the other variables for the two attendance groups. As was reported by the three

---

Table 2 About Here

---

studies cited in the review of literature, subject matter (plot and genre) was clearly the most important factor for attendance decisions. The data presented here also confirms previous research which demonstrated the low salience of "behind-the-screen" production personnel (producer, director, screenwriter). Unlike the Silvey and Kenyon and Los Angeles Times studies, a film's cast was not near the top of the list of important variables. Advertisements and critical commentary in the broadcast media were more important than in the print media.

Frequent movie-goers were found to have evaluated more of the 28 variables as being above the response scale neutral-point

(4.0) in importance than did occasional movie-goers (12 variables to 7 respectively). This suggests that frequent movie-goers use more variables to make a choice for movie attendance than do occasional movie-goers. That is, the component structure -- and hence appraisal process -- of frequent movie-goers is a more sophisticated and complex one than for occasional movie-goers; more variables are perceived as important in effecting the decision outcome. The difference in number of salient variables between attendance groups can be explained theoretically. Expectancy x Value theory, as applied to movie-going, would suggest that this greater number of salient variables influences frequency of engaging in the behavior: "the more values a person can achieve by a given form of behavior, the more he will engage in that behavior."[21] Thus, for the frequent movie-goer, who has a greater number of important variables than the occasional movie-goer, "the values of anticipated reward functions to enhance or strengthen the impulse to act."[22]

The second research question offered by this study also asked: What percentage of the movie attendance variance was predicted by these 28 variables? To provide an answer to this question, the 28 variables were entered by forward stepwise inclusion in a multiple regression analysis with movie attendance as the dependent variable. In the stepwise regression procedure, the most powerful independent variable (i.e., that variable which explains the greatest amount of variance in the dependent variable) is entered first, followed by the remaining independent variables according to the strength of their contribution to variance

explained in the dependent variable. As Jennrich notes, the stepwise routine allows the researcher to "steer the [predictor variable] additions by statistically meaningful criteria."[23] For this study the criteria utilized were: n in predictor list=28, F=.01, and tolerance=.001.[24]

Overall, for the sample as a whole, nearly one-third (R^2=31.4, F=1.816, $p < .001$) of the movie attendance variance was explained by these variables. This is a slightly higher percentage of variance explained than Austin found in his study of college students (R^2=28.6). The summary portion of the regression analysis for occasional film-goers is presented in Table 3 while Table 4 reports the results for frequent movie-

---

Table 3 About Here

Table 4 About Here

---

goers. As can be seen, 36.0% of the variance is explained for the occasional group and 89.7% for the frequent group. Austin's study of college students reported R^2 values of 32.6% for occasional movie-goers and 52.5% for frequent movie-goers.

From the sum total of the findings presented in this study it can be concluded that these 28 variables are more relevant, or important, to frequent movie-goers than occasional movie-goers. This conclusion is congruent with what Expectancy x Value theory would predict in that the more "rewards" or values offered

by a given activity, the more likely one is to engage in that activity. Therefore, persons who go to the movies more often than others find more of these variables as valuable and rewarding to them. Alternately, it can be proposed that the greater the number of variables viewed as being important, the more frequently movie attendance will occur. Expectancy x Value theory would hold the latter statement as more valid than the former. Conversely, these variables appear to be of only limited value to infrequent movie-goers. Thus the predictive power of these variables is applicable to a far larger extent among frequent than occasional movie-goers.

CONCLUSION

The 28-variable model for movie attendance decisions presented here offers multitudinous heuristic aspects. Two theoretically important issues will be briefly addressed here.[25] The method by which respondents were presented with the 28 variables provides us with a fairly good indication of these variables' salience once the individual has decided to attend a movie (as opposed to engaging in some other activity). Thus the present study presumes that the decision to alter existing activities has already been reached by the individual. The present study did not, however, attempt to analyze a necessary antecedent condition thereby leaving a central motivation theory question unanswered: What specific conditions determine how an individual <u>initially</u> becomes motivated to engage in movie-going as an activity? This is an important theoretical question in need of research attention.

The second theoretical issue in need of research attention is the temporal sequence involved in the motivational process. The question for study here is: Do the 28 variables increase in importance before frequency of attendance increases (i.e., increased salience causes more frequent movie-going) or does more frequent movie attendance (explained by some other theoretical construct) cause increased salience of the variables? This question suggests at least two others, each having related theoretical implications. First, there is a need to discover the process by which individuals assign increased importance to the variables. Second, there is a need to determine the causal factors that influence more frequent attendance among some individuals.

FOOTNOTES

[1]In 1953 Leo A. Handel ("Hollywood Market Research," The Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television 7 [Spring 1953]: 304-310) noted that "Audience research is well entrenched in all media of mass communication except film" (p. 310) and attributed this, in part, to Hollywood's resistance to such research.

[2]Bruce A. Austin, "Film Audience Research, 1960-1980: An Annotated Bibliography," Journal of Popular Film and Television 8 (1980, no. 2): 53-60.

[3]One might wish to compare the simple frequency of movie audience studies with, for example, those of a much more recent medium, television. If, for instance, one wishes to assess the body of literature pertaining to television and motion pictures vis-à-vis their audiences, and could only use one book, the point regarding the depth and breadth of knowledge concerning film audience research is made abundantly clear. For TV audience research perhaps the most current and comprehensive book one would choose to consult would be George Comstock et al.'s Television and Human Behavior (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978) in which one would find 510 pages of text surveying more than 2500 research reports. In contrast, the most current film audience research book is Leo A. Handel's Hollywood Looks at Its Audience (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950), containing 227 pages of text and fewer than 100 references.

[4]Thomas Simonet, "Industry," Film Comment 14 (January-February 1978): 72-73.

[5]See for example, Los Angeles Times, A Look at Southern California Movie-Going (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Times, 1972), which found that nearly three-quarters (73%) of its respondents (teenagers and adults) reported they had decided to see a particular picture before deciding to go to the movies, rather than the other way around (i.e., deciding to go to the movies before deciding which film to see).

[6]See for instance: Jay G. Blumler and Elihu Katz, The Uses of Mass Communication (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1974); Richard Dembo, "Gratifications Found in Media by British Teenage Boys," Journalism Quarterly 50 (Autumn 1973): 517-526; Kenneth A. Kaufman, "Why Do People Go to the Movies? -- A Study of Motion Picture Attendance as a Socially Comfortable Activity," unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1973; James M. O'Brien, "Experiencing the Popular Film: An Audience Gratifications Study," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1977.

[7]Marvin E. Olsen, "Motion Picture Attendance and Social Isolation," Sociological Quarterly 1 (April 1960): 107-116; Marvin E. Olsen, "Correction of 'Motion Picture Attendance and Social Isolation,'" Sociological Quarterly 6 (Spring 1965): 179.

[8]Philip Anast, "Personality Determinants of Mass Media Preferences," Journalism Quarterly 43 (Winter 1966): 729-732.

[9]Heinz Heckhausen, "Achievement Motivation and its Constructs: A Cognitive Model," Motivation and Emotion 1 (December 1977): 285.

[10]A. K. Korman, The Psychology of Motivation (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 122.

[11]To cite just a few examples from the plethora of armchair philosophy available, see: Lee Beaupre, "Grosses Gloss: Breaking Away at the Box-Office," Film Comment 16 (March-April 1980): 69-73; I. C. Jarvie, Movies and Society (New York: Basic Books, 1970); Michael F. Mayer, The Film Industries, 2nd ed. (New York: Hastings House, 1978), especially Chapter 5, "The Elements of Popularity," pp. 33-45; Chris Munsun, "The Marketing of Motion Pictures," unpublished D.B.A. thesis, University of Southern California, 1969.

[12]For research on stars see: Gorham Kindem, "Hollywood's Movie Star System and the Film Industry in the 1940's," paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Culture and Communication, Philadelphia, PA, April 1981 and Thomas Simonet, "Performers' Marquee Values in Relation to Top-Grossing Films," paper presented at the Society for Cinema Studies Conference, Philadelphia, PA, March 1978; for research on critics and film directors see: Thomas Simonet and Kenneth Harwood, "Popular Favorites and Critics' Darlings Among Film Directors in American Release, 1930-1971," paper presented at the Society for Cinema Studies Conference, Evanston, IL, March 1977 and Jules J. Wanderer, "In Defense of Popular Taste: Film Ratings Among Professional and Lay Audiences," American Journal of Sociology 76 (September 1970): 262-272; for research on word-of-mouth see Thomas O'Guinn, "The Audience's Choice: Movie Selection and Word of Mouth," paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, Minneapolis, MN, May 1981 and Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1955).

[13]This is not to suggest that sample survey (self-report) data is without flaw; such is clearly not the case. For research using non-survey methods see for instance: Barry R. Litman, "An Empirical Analysis of Theatrical Movie Popularity," paper presented at the Popular Culture Association Conference, Detroit, MI, April 1980; Kindem, "Hollywood's Movie Star System," ibid.; Gorham A. Kindem, "Statistical Analysis of Non-Theatrical Feature Film Exhibition: A Predictive Model for University Film Attendance," Journal of the University Film Association 32 (Fall 1980): 55-59; Simonet, "Performers' Marquee Values," ibid.; Simonet and Harwood, "Popular Favorites and Critics' Darlings," ibid.; and Thomas S. Simonet, Regression Analysis of Prior Experiences of Key Production Personnel as Predictors of Revenues from High-Grossing Motion Pictures in American Release (New York: Arno Press, 1980).

[14]Robert Silvey and Judy Kenyon, "Why You Go to the Pictures," Films and Filming 11 (June 1965): 4-5, 36.

[15]Los Angeles Times, A Look at Southern California Movie-Going, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

[16]Bruce A. Austin, "Film Attendance: Why College Students Chose to See Their Most Recent Film," paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, April 1981. See also Bruce A. Austin, "Motion Picture Attendance and Factors Influencing Movie Selection Among High School Students," paper presented at the University Film Association Conference, Ithaca, NY, August 1979 (available in ERIC, ED 177 630).

[17]Copies of the questionnaire are available from the author.

[18]The justification for using inferential statistics with a nonprobability sample may be found in Robert F. Winch and Donald T. Campbell, "Proof? No. Evidence? Yes. The Significance of Tests of Significance," American Sociologist 4 (May 1969): 140-143.

[19]Full details of the reliability check are presented in Bruce A. Austin, "M.P.A.A. Rating Influence on Stated Likelihood of High School Student Film Attendance: A Test of Reactance Theory," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1981.

[20]Austin, "Film Attendance," op. cit.

[21]Korman, The Psychology of Motivation, p. 201.

[22]J. W. Atkinson, An Introduction to Motivation (Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1964), p. 212.

[23]Robert I. Jennrich, "Stepwise Regression," in Kurt Enslein, Anthony Ralston, and Herbert S. Wilf (Eds.), Statistical Methods for Digital Computers, vol. 3 (NY: John Wiley & Sons, 1977), p. 58.

[24]For a discussion and explanation of these criteria and related aspects of multiple regression analysis see Norman H. Nie et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2nd ed. (NY: McGraw-Hill, 1975), pp. 320-367.

[25]Other important heuristic aspects include the "purity" of the variables themselves (e.g., one might argue that the influence of virtually all the production variables, as well as plot and genre, are contingent on sources external to the variables themselves). This point has been discussed by Austin, "Film Attendance," op. cit., and Austin, "M.P.A.A. Rating," op. cit.

TABLE 1

ATTENTION FACTOR FOR MOST RECENT

MOVIE EXPERIENCE

	OCCASIONAL MOVIE-GOERS	FREQUENT MOVIE-GOERS
Theme/plot	42.7%	35.5%
Word-of-mouth	20.2%	22.6%
Star	14.6%	19.4%
Other	10.1%	12.9%
TV ads	6.7%	6.5%
Previews	2.2%	0.0%
Reviews	1.1%	3.2%
Newspaper ads	2.2%	0.0%

$X^2=2.96$, df=7, $p > .05$

TABLE 2

MEAN SCORES* AND RANK-ORDER FOR IMPORTANCE OF

MOVIE ATTENDANCE VARIABLES

	OCCASIONAL MOVIE-GOERS (n=93)			FREQUENT MOVIE-GOERS (n=37)		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank
Plot	5.27	1.80	2	5.45	1.59	1
Genre	5.33	1.92	1	5.27	1.72	2
Friends' comments	4.94	2.00	3	5.27	2.06	2
TV ads	4.45	1.93	4	4.75	2.12	3
Title	4.16	2.05	5	4.75	1.86	3
Color photography	4.05	2.46	6	4.75	2.33	3
Previews	3.95	2.17	9	4.70	2.14	4
Radio ads	3.90	2.00	10	4.40	2.21	5
Black & white photography	3.76	2.38	11	4.29	2.37	7
Music	3.69	2.26	13	4.40	2.30	5
MPAA rating	3.72	2.16	12	4.35	2.17	6
Price of admission	3.97	2.15	8	3.62	2.27	11
Proximity of theater	4.02	2.25	7	3.32	1.76	14
Female star	3.54	2.32	14	4.02	2.40	8
Male star	3.12	2.09	16	3.94	2.32	9
Newspaper ads	3.13	1.91	15	3.81	1.96	10
Magazine ads	3.10	1.90	17	3.27	1.92	15
TV critics	2.96	1.79	19	3.48	2.12	13
Oscar nomination	2.84	1.97	21	3.24	2.15	16
Oscar winning	2.91	2.04	20	3.54	2.18	12
Radio critics	2.69	1.66	24	3.21	1.91	17
Parents' comments	2.82	1.82	22	2.67	1.95	20
Incidental costs	2.97	2.18	18	2.24	1.72	24
Magazine critics	2.72	1.84	23	2.75	1.77	18
Newspaper critics	2.67	1.77	25	2.72	1.92	19
Producer	1.74	1.51	26	2.48	2.04	21
Director	1.69	1.53	27	2.43	1.99	22
Writer	1.44	1.03	28	2.32	1.91	23
$\bar{X}$ by column	3.41			3.76		
SD by column		1.96			2.04	

*1=very unimportant, 7=very important

TABLE 3

SUMMARY TABLE FOR STEPWISE REGRESSION WITH MOVIE ATTENDANCE AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE: OCCASIONAL MOVIE-GOERS

PREDICTOR VARIABLES	R^2	BETA
Radio ads	.057	.089
Writer	114	-.285
Black & white photography	.140	.267
Proximity of theater	.163	-.360
Genre	.187	.388
Oscar winning	.212	.566
Magazine ads	.234	-.424
Friends' comments	.261	.181
Radio critics	.276	.269
Plot	.294	-.218
Previews	.309	.154
Male star	.323	-.157
Oscar nomination	.334	-.351
Color photography	.338	-.122
Title	.343	.076
Female star	.346	.077
MPAA ratings	.349	.052
Incidental costs	.352	-.079
Parents' comments	.354	-.077
Newspaper ads	.357	.090
Price of admission	.358	.044
TV ads	.359	-.031
Music	.359	-.031
TV critics	.360	-.031
Producer	.360	.017

Constant 2.498

overall $F=1.509$

$df=25,67$

$p > .05$

adjusted $R^2=.121$

TABLE 4

SUMMARY TABLE FOR STEPWISE REGRESSION WITH MOVIE ATTENDANCE AS THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE: FREQUENT MOVIE-GOERS

PREDICTOR VARIABLES	R^2	BETA
Producer	.178	-.689
Incidental costs	.244	-.357
Oscar winning	.329	.027
Friends' comments	.384	.714
Radio ads	.467	-.717
Title	.536	.411
Female star	.600	-.105
Previews	.637	-.523
Plot	.676	-.054
Parents' comments	.697	.587
Price of admission	.709	-.410
Black & white photography	.724	.298
Newspaper ads	.738	.180
Genre	.755	-.479
Music	.767	-.019
Writer	.794	.584
Magazine ads	.813	.453
Oscar nomination	.822	.092
Color photography	.837	-.152
Male star	.861	-.414
Magazine critics	.870	-.155
Proximity of theater	.872	.356
TV critics	.876	.824
Radio critics	.882	-.555
TV ads	.889	.517
Newspaper critics	.894	-.289
MPAA rating	.897	.182
Constant	5.001	

overall $F=2.930$

$df=27,9$

$p < .05$

adjusted $R^2 = .591$